



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/424,636	11/29/1999	HEIKKI ILVESPA	990.1210	8271

7590 09/12/2003
STEINBERG & RASKIN
1140 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS
NEW YORK, NY 10036

EXAMINER

HALPERN, MARK

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1731

DATE MAILED: 09/12/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/424,636

Applicant(s)

HEIKI ILVESPA

Examiner

Mark Halpern

Art Unit

1731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☒ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-28 and 30-39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 29,40 and 41 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 6.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 1) Claims 22-23, 25-26, 32-35, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Meinecke (5,169,501).

Claims 22-23, 25-26, 33-35: Meinecke discloses web 9 being passed between continuous loops formed by upper felt 12 and lower felt 11, as the web travels into a nip 19 formed between upper press roll 14 and lower backing roll 13. Said nip 19 is an extended-nip press and is the last nip in the press section 10. The bottom felt 11 is a transfer belt on which web 9 is adhering as it is transferred from the press section 10 to the dryer section 20. Within the transfer felt 11 loop are drying cylinders 21, 22, that heat the passing web. The web is then picked up on suction roll 29 to subsequent dryer station. The drying cylinders within loop 11 include a plurality of reversing guide suction rolls 24 so that the web is reversed as it passes on the rolls and is dried on the drying cylinders (col. 4, line 13 to col. 5, line 14, and Figure 1). The various belt supporting rolls 15, 17, 26, 27, are shown in Figure 1.

Claim 32: the nip of Meinecke is an extended nip, which reads on the nip being an equalizing press. There is with no additional felt in the nip.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2) Claims 27, 37, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meinecke. Meinecke is applied as above for claims 26, 33, Meinecke discloses that the web is passed on by means of pickup suction roll 29 and is passed to a subsequent dryer station, however, Meinecke is silent regarding the second drying station being a group of drying cylinders. It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, that the second drying station consists of drying cylinders, because the use of secondary drying cylinders would simplify the maintenance and reduce the operation cost of the process of papermaking.

3) Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meinecke in view of Karvinen (5,611,892). Meinecke is applied as above for claim 37, Meinecke is silent regarding the drying cylinders being steam-heated drying cylinders. Karvinen discloses web being transferred over a transfer belt to a drying section containing drying cylinders 28 which are steam heated (Karvinen, col. 13, lines 10-20). It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Meinecke and Karvinen, because such a combination

Art Unit: 1731

would increase adhesion of the web to the heaters in the design of Meinecke as disclosed by Karvinen (col. 13, lines 15-20).

4) Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meinecke in view of Wicks (4,483,745). Meinecke is applied as above for claim 22, Meinecke fails to disclose that the transfer belt is impenetrable by air and water. Wicks discloses transfer belt 40 which picks up web W and transfers it through a nip 48 formed by rolls 41 and 42 onto a group of drying cylinders. The transfer belt of Wicks is a smooth impervious belt (Wicks, col. 3, lines 50-60, and Figure 2). This reads on the claimed feature that the transfer belt is impenetrable. It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Meinecke and Wicks, because such a combination would prevent rewetting of the web in the design of Meinecke as disclosed by Wicks (col. 1, lines 45-55).

5) Claims 28, 30-31, 36, 39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meinecke in view of Schiel (4,000,035).

Claims 28, 39: Meinecke is applied as above for claim 26, Meinecke fails to disclose that the drying cylinders comprise impingement drying units. Schiel discloses web 1 being transferred in nip formed by roll 4 and roll 3 onto belt 5 that includes drying cylinders 6, 7, 10, of which cylinders 6 and 7 contain hoods 11 and 12 from which hot air is blown onto the passing web. This reads on claimed impingement drying (Schiel, col. 4, lines 18-68, and Figure 1). It would have been obvious, to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made, to combine the teachings of Meinecke and Schiel,

Art Unit: 1731

because such a combination would reduce the time and provide optimum drying of the web in the design of Meinecke as disclosed by Schiel (col. 2, lines 5-14).

Claim 30: oblong hood of the drying units are shown in Figure 1 of Schiel.

Claim 31: Meinecke discloses that the drying system is arranged in a vertical configuration (Meinecke, col. 5, lines 10-14) and shows plurality of support rolls as shown in Figures 1, 4. The use of two impingement drying units is disclosed by Schiel.

Claim 36: of the drying units of Schiel, cylinder 10 is a reversing roll as shown in Figure 1.

Allowable Subject Matter

6) Claims 29, 40-41, are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The primary reason for indicating allowable subject matter is that the cited prior art does not show an equipment for transferring a paper/board web in a paper or board machine, said equipment including an impingement drying unit arranged after a press nip and before a first group of drying cylinders (claims 29, 40-41).

Conclusion

7) **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

8) Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Halpern whose telephone number is 703-305-4522. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, (9:00-5:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin can be reached on 703-308-1164. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0651.

MH

Mark Halpern
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1731


STEVEN P. GRIFFIN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700